

Application No.: 10/544,573
Art Unit: 3732

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 052875

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 8 - 13.

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the above-identified application, with claims 14-27 being withdrawn. Claims 1-8 are herein amended. No new matter is entered. It is respectfully submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the Office action mailed on December 17, 2008.

Objection to Drawings:

The drawings were objected to for not being clear. Applicants present original, high quality replacement drawings for figures 9-13. Applicants respectfully submit that these high quality drawings address the objection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph:

Claims 7-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 7-9 rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Regarding claims 10 and 12, the Examiner states that the parameter of the “wire diameter” has not been defined, therefore it is unclear as to what constitutes a thickness to bury more than half a wire diameter.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that the adhesive layer of the net member has a thickness more than half of a diameter of the net member. In addition, it is known in the arts

that the diameter of the net member is between 100 μm to 150 μm . Please see paragraph [0004] in Page 4 in English Text of PCT/W2004/010425.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 7/2, 7/3, 7/4, 7/5, 9-11, 12/1, 12/2, 12/9, 13/12/1, 13/12/2 and 13/12/9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Maekawa* (US Patent 6,170,491).

In the rejection, the Examiner states:

Maekawa discloses a double stick adhesive tape for a wig which as a net member (3) as a portion of the wig base (2) comprising two adhesive layers (21a, 21b) of a double-stick adhesive tape. A first side of adhesive layer (21a) is formed to have a thickness to bury more than half of a wire diameter of the net member (3) (column 3, lines 48-55).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's statement. *Maekawa* describes:

...a wig-fitting component or element 1 comprises a net-type or net-shaped component 3 stuck on one side of a flexible planar component 2 with adhesive 21a, 21b adhered to opposite sides of component 2. (See 4th line from bottom to last line in the column 2 of US 6,170,491).

...when natural hair comes into contact with the surface of net-like component 3, the natural hair is tangled by the adhesive 21a and easily becomes adhered thereto. (See column 3, lines 51-55).

More specifically, *Maekawa* discloses a double stick adhesive tape for a wig that has a net-type or net-shaped component 3 arranged in the side of skin of scalp, not the wig

base side. *Maekawa* discloses only how easily tangled the natural hair is to the adhesive 21a. Therefore *Maekawa* does not teach the adhesive layer to the net member for fitting the net member of a wig base.

Further, *Maekawa* does not disclose or fairly suggest a thickness of the adhesive layer to the net member of a wig base.

In contrast, the claimed invention discloses a double stick adhesive tape for fitting a wig, not natural hair. Since *Maekawa* does not teach the adhesive layer attached to the net member for fitting the net member of a wig base, it is not a matter of design choice.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is neither disclosed nor suggested when viewed in light of *Shin*, US-2002/0056465, and *Maekawa*.

Regarding *Gold* (US-2004/0237987), it does not disclose a double-stick adhesive tape having two adhesive layers for a wig. Accordingly *Gold* does not disclose or fairly suggest the claimed invention when viewed in light of *Maekawa*.


Application No.: 10/544,573
Art Unit: 3732

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 052875

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Dennis M. Hubbs
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,145
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DMH/rer

Attachments: Replacement Sheets – Figs. 8-13